



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

V.

But, when night had passed, Charlemagne the emperor rose up at dawn and listened to the matins and mass and all the services, and then king Charlemagne called upon his noble men, for he wished to follow the counsel of the Frenchmen. And thereafter in the morning, when the emperor Charlemagne had seated himself at a table and upon his high seats and called to him his barons, the twelve peers came, those whom king Charlemagne loved much, and more than 1000 other Frenchmen came. Earl Guinelun was also there, who began the treason, and then they took counsel, but that ended ill, which was worse (or, as was to be expected, B.). Now when they were all together at this assembly, king Charlemagne began his speech in this wise: "Good captains," he said, "take counsel for me and for yourselves. King Marsilius sent hither his messengers, as ye know, and he offers me great wealth; many lions, good horses, 400 camels charged with gold from Arabia, and 100 mules. He will also give me 50 wagons laden with precious things, and he will come to meet me in France and will hold Spain (as a feoff) from me and be subject to me all his life long, and he will give me hostages (as a surety) that this shall be fulfilled; but I do not know what he has in mind." Charlemagne closed his speech. The French replied, "We must think over this." Then Rollant stood up and spoke thus: "Thou trustest without justification king Marsile. Seven years are now passed, since we came to his land, and I have endured many troubles in thy service. I conquered for thee the city of Nobilis and Morinde, Valterne and Pine, Balauigie, Rudile, Sibili, Port and Aulert, which stands on the borderland. But king Marsilius has often shown treachery and breach of faith toward thee. A short time ago he sent to thee twelve of his barons, in the same guise as he now sends, and every one of them had in his hand an olive-branch, and they bore such tidings as these reported yesterday evening, that their king would become a Christian; thou tookest then counsel with the Frenchmen, but they advised thee unwisely. Thou sentest then two of thy earls to king Marsilius, Basan and Basilies, and

he did like an evil traitor, and caused them to lose their lives.—"Continue thy warfare sire," said Rollant, "and go with all thy force to Saragucie; but thereafter let us besiege the city and desist not, until we capture it, and so avenge our men, those whom the traitor caused to be slain." The emperor Charlemagne bent his head and stroked his beard and moustache, and answered not a word. The Frenchmen then kept silence, all save earl Guinelun. He rose up and went before king Charlemagne and began: "Good emperor," he said, "thou must not trust the counsel of a foolish man, neither my counsel nor that of others, unless there be gain therein for thee. But since king Marsilius has sent thee word, that he will become a Christian and thy vassal, that man who refuses it, cares not what death we suffer. But it is not right that proud counsels should prevail,—let us abandon foolishness and accept hale counsels."—After these words of earl Guinelun, Nemes went before king Charlemagne, and there was no better man in all king Charlemagne's guard. He began: "King Charlemagne," said he, "hear the answer of earl Guinelun; it were exceeding well, if that which he has said should be performed. Now king Marsilius is overcome in his kingdom; thou hast won from him castles and cities, districts and towns, and subdued under thee wellnigh all his kingdom, and he is self-compassionate, when he begs for mercy, and that were great dishonor, if he should not serve to thy honor. Now thou must, for God's sake and thine own honor, show mercy to him; send to him now one of thy barons.—If he will insure thee with hostages, as he has declared, then that is well and it is wise that this host move not." Several Frenchmen answered: "Thou hast spoken well, duke" (163-243).

CHARLES SPRAGUE SMITH.

New York City.

MR. FLEAY ON NICHOLAS UDALL.

MR. F.G. FLEAY, in his invaluable but exasperating 'Chronicle History of the London Stage,' published last year, has expressed himself with a singular lack of clearness on the subject of

NICHOLAS UDALL,¹ the author of "Roister Doister." At p. 16 he tells us:

"On Aug. 8, [1564,] Ezechias, made by Mr. Udall, was acted by King's College men only at ix. of the clock at night. This was an English play. No inference can be drawn (as Mr. Collier supposed, i. 184) as to Udall's not dying in 1557. The play may have been an old one."

Yet at p. 59 we have the following note:

"Rafe Royster Doyster, by Nicholas Udall, was entered S[tationers']. R[egister]. 1566-7. It was probably acted early (I conjecture 6th March, 1561), as it, like other plays of the first three years of Elizabeth, was a revival of an Edward VI. interlude. But in this instance a thorough revision was made, and, I think, the whole play was rewritten. Compare the Psalmody at the end with that in the play, and note the use of Queen (not King) in the play itself. I think it far too finished a production in its present state as published 1566-7 to have remained unimitated for ten years; and it certainly does not follow that because the letter in it was quoted in Sir Thomas Wilson's Rule of Reason in 1551, the rest of the play remained equally unaltered. The allusion to Plautus and Terence in the Prologue shows the models the author had before him The acting of Ezechias before the Queen at Cambridge in 1564, also by Udall, would point to a still later date than I have conjectured, viz., to Christmas 1564-5. Elizabeth may have met with Udall at Cambridge, and commanded another play of him, if she liked the Ezechias."

Further, in his "List of Authors," at p. 378, Mr. FLEAY gives UDALL's name with "1560, 1564" as "date of writing." Surely this entry, taken in connection with the note at p. 59, just quoted, justifies one in ascribing to Mr. FLEAY the belief that UDALL himself revised his own "Roister Doister" for the (conjectural) performance of 1561, and that the "Ezechias" was *written*, as well as played, in 1564. What then, is the reason that Mr. FLEAY, at p. 16, refuses to allow COLLIER to draw an inference from the performance of the "Ezechias" in 1564 "as to Udall's not dying in 1557," when he himself apparently draws the same inference at p. 59? And further, what does he make of the supposed record of UDALL's burial on the 23d of December, 1556 ("23 die Nicolas Yevedall"), first

¹ Compare the inconsistent statements of COLLIER: (1) "Udall died in 1565" (ii, 352). (2) "Udall died in 1557" (ii, 365).

quoted from the register of burials in the parish of St. Margaret's, Westminster, by COOPER, in his Shakespeare Society edition of "Roister Doister" and "Gorbuduc," 1847, p. xxxiv? This record corresponds remarkably well with the MS. note by BALE printed in BLISS's edition of WOOD's 'Athenae Oxonienses,' 1813, i, 213, n. 5: "Nic. Udallus obiit A. D. 1557, Westmonasterii sepultus." If the "Nicolas Yevedall" buried in 1556 was the author of "Roister Doister," Mr. FLEAY's suggestion that ELIZABETH "may have met with Udall at Cambridge [in 1564, apparently], and commanded another play of him," seems singularly idle. One is astonished to find it—of all places—in a section put into its present shape expressly that the reader may, in the words of the author, "judge of the minuteness and accuracy of my work, and decide if he can withhold his judgment in cases where I may have to anticipate my farther investigations until they also shall pass the press." If Mr. FLEAY does not admit the identity of "Yevedall" with UDALL,² or if he has discovered fresh evidence as to the date of UDALL's death, surely he should tell usso in this "intercalatory section"; but he does not even mention the "Yevedall" entry. From a scholar so censorious as Mr. FLEAY and so little inclined to extenuate the merits of his own work, one surely has a right to expect more clearness in so important a matter.

GEORGE LYMAN KITTREDGE.
Cambridge, Mass.

THE MORRIS-SKEAT CHAUCER.

WHILE agreeing in the main with Prof. TOLMAN's notes on the MORRIS-SKEAT edition of CHAUCER's 'Prologue' etc. (MOD. LANG. NOTES, v, 233 ff.), I venture to dissent from him in one or two slight particulars.

L. 83, "*evene lengthe*" is not "proper height" (what was the proper height of a squire?) but 'middle stature.'

L. 107. I think it would have puzzled Robin

² UDALL's name is written "Vuedale" in the MS. which contains his and LELAND's pageant-verses for ANNE BOLEYNE (Royal MS. 18. A. 1xiv, leaf 1; see FURNIVALL, 'Ballads from Manuscripts,' I, 378, Ballad Society), and "Uvedale" in the register of the Privy Council, March 14, 1542 (NICHOLAS, 'Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council,' VII, 153, quoted by COOPER, p. xvii.).